arXiv:1606.04394v1 [cs.DM] 14 Jun 2016

Partitioning sparse graphs into an independent set and a forest of bounded degree

François Dross[a], Mickael Montassier[a], and Alexandre Pinlou[a,b]

[a] *Université de Montpellier, CNRS, LIRMM*
[b] *Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3, CNRS, LIRMM*

161 rue Ada, 34095 Montpellier Cedex 5, France
{francois.dross,mickael.montassier,alexandre.pinlou}@lirmm.fr

June 15, 2016

Abstract

An $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{F}_d)$-partition of a graph is a partition of the vertices of the graph into two sets I and F, such that I is an independent set and F induces a forest of maximum degree at most d. We show that for all $M < 3$ and $d \geq \frac{2}{3-M} - 2$, if a graph has maximum average degree less than M, then it has an $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{F}_d)$-partition. Additionally, we prove that for all $\frac{8}{3} \leq M < 3$ and $d \geq \frac{1}{3-M}$, if a graph has maximum average degree less than M then it has an $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{F}_d)$-partition.

1 Introduction

In this paper, unless we specify otherwise, all the graph considered are simple graphs, without loops or multi-edges.

For i classes of graphs $\mathcal{G}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{G}_i$, a $(\mathcal{G}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{G}_i)$-*partition* of a graph G is a partition of the vertices of G into i sets $V_1, \ldots, V_i$ such that, for all $1 \leq j \leq i$, the graph $G[V_j]$ induced by V_j belongs to $\mathcal{G}_j$.

In the following we will consider the following classes of graphs:

- $\mathcal{F}$ the class of forests,
- $\mathcal{F}_d$ the class of forests with maximum degree at most d,
- Δ_d the class of graphs with maximum degree at most d,
- $\mathcal{I}$ the class of empty graphs (i.e. graphs with no edges).

For example, an $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{F}, \Delta_2)$-partition of G is a vertex-partition into three sets V_1, V_2, V_3 such that $G[V_1]$ is an empty graph, $G[V_2]$ is a forest, and $G[V_3]$ is a graph with maximum degree at most 2. Note that $\Delta_0 = \mathcal{F}_0 = I$ and $\Delta_1 = \mathcal{F}_1$.

The *average degree* of a graph G with n vertices and m edges, denoted by $\mathrm{ad}(G)$, is equal to $\frac{2m}{n}$. The *maximum average degree* of a graph G, denoted by $\mathrm{mad}(G)$, is the

maximum of $\mathrm{ad}(H)$ over all subgraphs H of G. The *girth* of a graph G is the length of a smallest cycle in G, and infinity if G has no cycle.

Many results on partitions of sparse graphs appear in the literature, where a graph is said to be sparse if it has a low maximum average degree, or if it is planar and has a large girth. The study of partitions of sparse graphs started with the Four Colour Theorem [1, 2], which states that every planar graph admits an $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I})$-partition. Borodin [3] proved that every planar graph admits an $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F})$-partition, and Borodin and Glebov [4] proved that every planar graph with girth at least 5 admits an $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{F})$-partition. Poh [10] proved that every planar graph admits an $(\mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$-partition.

More recently, Borodin and Kostochka [7] showed that for all $j \geq 0$ and $k \geq 2j+2$, every graph G with $\mathrm{mad}(G) < 2\left(2 - \frac{k+2}{(j+2)(k+1)}\right)$ admits a (Δ_j, Δ_k)-partition. In particular, every graph G with $\mathrm{mad}(G) < \frac{8}{3}$ admits an (I, Δ_2)-partition, and every graph G with $\mathrm{mad}(G) < \frac{14}{5}$ admits an (I, Δ_4)-partition. With Euler's formula, this yields that planar graphs with girth at least 7 admit (I, Δ_4)-partitions, and that planar graphs with girth at least 8 admit (I, Δ_2)-partitions. Borodin and Kostochka [6] proved that every graph G with $\mathrm{mad}(G) < \frac{12}{5}$ admits an (I, Δ_1)-partition, which implies that that every planar graph with girth at least 12 admits an (I, Δ_1)-partition. This last result was improved by Kim, Kostochka and Zhu [9], who proved that every triangle-free graph with maximum average degree at most $\frac{11}{9}$ admits an (I, Δ_1)-partition, and thus that every planar graph with girth at least 11 admits an (I, Δ_1)-partition. In contrast with these results, Borodin, Ivanova, Montassier, Ochem and Raspaud [5] proved that for every d, there exists a planar graph of girth at least 6 that admits no (I, Δ_d)-partition.

It can be interesting to find partitions of sparse graphs into a forest and a forest of bounded degree, that is $(I, \mathcal{F}_d)$-partitions. Note that if a graph admits an $(I, \mathcal{F}_d)$-partition, then it admits an (I, Δ_d)-partition, and that an $(I, \mathcal{F}_1)$-partition is the same as an (I, Δ_1)-partition. Therefore the previous results imply that:

- for every d, there exists a planar graph of girth at least 6 that admits no (I, Δ_d)-partition;
- every planar graph with girth at least 11 admits an $(I, \mathcal{F}_1)$-partition.

Here are the main results of our paper:

Theorem 1. *Let M be a real number such that $M < 3$. Let $d \geq 0$ be an integer, and let G be a graph with $\mathrm{mad}(G) < M$. If $d \geq \frac{2}{3-M} - 2$, then G admits an $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{F}_d)$-partition.*

Theorem 2. *Let M be a real number such that $\frac{8}{3} \leq M < 3$. Let $d \geq 0$ be an integer, and let G be a graph with $\mathrm{mad}(G) < M$. If $d \geq \frac{1}{3-M}$, then G admits an $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{F}_d)$-partition.*

By a direct application of Euler's formula, every planar graph with girth at least g has maximum average degree less than $\frac{2g}{g-2}$. That yields the following corollary:

Corollary 3. *Let G be a planar graph with girth at least g.*

1. *If $g \geq 7$, then G admits an $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{F}_5)$-partition.*
2. *If $g \geq 8$, then G admits an $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{F}_3)$-partition.*
3. *If $g \geq 10$, then G admits an $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{F}_2)$-partition.*

Corollaries 3.2 and 3.3 are obtained from Theorem 2, whereas Corollary 3.1 is obtained from Theorem 1. See Table 1 for an overview of the results on vertex partitions of planar graphs presented above.

Classes	Vertex-partitions	References
Planar graphs	$(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I})$ $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F})$ $(\mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$	The Four Color Theorem [1, 2] Borodin [3] Poh [10]
Planar graphs with girth 5	$(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{F})$	Borodin and Glebov [4]
Planar graphs with girth 6	no $(\mathcal{I}, \Delta_d)$	Borodin et al. [5]
Planar graphs with girth 7	$(\mathcal{I}, \Delta_4)$ $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{F}_5)$	Borodin and Kostochka [7] Present paper
Planar graphs with girth 8	$(\mathcal{I}, \Delta_2)$ $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{F}_3)$	Borodin and Kostochka [7] Present paper
Planar graphs with girth 10	$(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{F}_2)$	Present paper
Planar graphs with girth 11	$(\mathcal{I}, \Delta_1)$	Kim, Kostochka and Zhu [9]

Table 1: Known results on planar graphs.

2 Proof of Theorem 1

Let $M < 3$, and let d be an integer such that $d \geq \frac{2}{3-M} - 2$. Let us call a *good* d-partition of a graph G a partition (I, F) of the vertices of G such that I is an independent set of G, $G[F]$ is a graph with maximum degree d, and every cycle in $G[F]$ goes through a vertex with degree 2 in G. Note that for any graph G, if G admits a good d-partition, then G admits an $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{F}_d)$-partition: while there is a vertex v with degree 2 in G that is in F and has two neighbours in F, move v from F to I. Theorem 1 is implied by the following lemma:

Lemma 4. *Every graph G with $\mathrm{mad}(G) < M$ has a good d-partition.*

Our proof uses the discharging method. For the sake of contradiction, assume that Lemma 4 is false. Let G be a counter example to Lemma 4 with minimum order.

For all k, a vertex of degree k, at least k, or at most k in G is a k-vertex, a k^+-vertex, or a k^--vertex respectively. A $(d+1)^-$-vertex is a *small* vertex, and a $(d+2)^+$-vertex is a *big* vertex. Let v be a vertex of G. For all k, a neighbour of v of degree k, at least k, or at most k in G is a k-neighbour, a k^+-neighbour, or a k^--neighbour of v respectively. A neighbour of v that is a big vertex is a *big neighbour* of v, and a neighbour of v that is a small vertex is a *small neighbour* of v. We start by proving some lemmas on the structure of G. Specifically, we prove that some configurations are reducible, and thus cannot occur in G.

Lemma 5. *There are no 1^--vertices in G.*

Proof. Assume there is a 1^--vertex v in G. The graph $G - v$ has one fewer vertex than G, and thus, by minimality of G, admits a good d-partition (I, F). If v has no neighbours in I, then we can add it to I. Otherwise, it has no neighbours in F, and we can add it to F. In both cases, that leads to a good d-partition of G, a contradiction. □

Lemma 6. *Every 2-vertex has at least one big neighbour.*

Proof. Assume v is a 2-vertex adjacent to two small vertices, u and w. The graph $G - v$ has one fewer vertex than G, and thus, by minimality of G, admits a good d-partition (I, F). If u and w are both in F, then we can put v in I, and if they are both in I, then

we can put v in F. Therefore without loss of generality, we can assume that $u \in I$ and $w \in F$. If w has no neighbours in I, then we can put it in I, and put v in F. Therefore we can assume that w has at least one neighbour in I and thus at most $d-1$ neighbours in F (since w is a small vertex in G). Then v has at most one neighbour in F, and this neighbour w has at most $d-1$ neighbours in $G[F]$, thus we can add v to F. In every case, this leads to a good d-partition of G, a contradiction. □

A 2-vertex is a *leaf* if it is adjacent to a small vertex, and it is a *non-leaf 2-vertex* otherwise. Note that by Lemma 6, each 2-vertex has at most one small neighbour.

Lemma 7. *Let B be a set of small 3^+-vertices such that $G[B]$ is a tree. There exists a 3^+-vertex $v \notin B$ that is adjacent to a vertex of B.*

Proof. Assume that the lemma is false, that is every vertex that is not in B but has a neighbour in B is a 2-vertex. By minimality of G, $G-B$ admits a good d-partition (I, F). For every vertex v in B, successively, we put v in I if v has no neighbours in I and we put it in F otherwise. Note that this way a vertex that we add to F has at most d neighbours that are not in I, and we cannot make any cycle in $G[F]$ that does not go through a 2-vertex, since $G[B]$ is a tree. Thus we have a good d-partition of G, a contradiction. □

Let B be a (maximal) set of small 3^+-vertices such that:

(a) $G[B]$ is a tree,

(b) there is only one edge that links a vertex of B to a 3^+-vertex u outside of B,

(c) u is a big vertex.

We call B a *bud* with father u.

Let us build the *light forest* L, by the following three steps:

1. While there are leaves that are not in L, do the following. Pick a leaf v, and let u be the big neighbour of v (that exists by Lemma 6). Add to L the vertex v, the edge uv, and the vertex u (if it is not already in L). Also set that u is the *father* of v (and v is a *son* of u). See Figure 1, left. Note that by doing this, we obtain a star forest with only big vertices and leaves. Also note that the set of the big vertices and the set of the leaves are independent sets in L (but not necessarily in G).

2. While there are buds that are not in L, do the following. Pick a bud B. Let u be the father of B, and let v be the vertex of B adjacent to u. Add $G[B]$ to L, as well as the edge uv, and the vertex u (if it is not already in L). The vertex u is the father of v, and the father/son relationship in B is that of the tree $G[B]$ rooted at v. See Figure 1, middle.

3. While, for some k, there exists a big k-vertex $w \in L$ that has $k-1$ sons in L and whose last neighbour is a 2-vertex that is not in L, do the following. Let v be the 2-neighbour of w that is not in L, and let u be the neighbour of v distinct from w. Note that v is a non-leaf 2-vertex (since it was not added to L in Step 1), therefore u is a big vertex. Add to L the vertex v, the edges uv and vw, and the vertex u (if it is not already in L). We set that v is the father of w, and that u is the father of v. See Figure 1, right. Note that by doing this, L remains a rooted forest, and that each of the set of the big vertices and the set of the 2-vertices remains independent in L.



Figure 1: The construction of the light forest L. The big vertices are represented with big circles, and the small vertices with small circles. The filled circles represent vertices whose incident edges are all represented. The dashed lines are the continuation of the light forest. The arrows point from son to father in L.

As noticed previously, L is a rooted forest. We say that a vertex v is a *descendant* of a vertex $u \neq v$ in L if there are vertices $v_0 = v$, v_1, ..., $v_k = u$ in L, such that for $i \in \{0, 1, ..., k-1\}$, v_{i+1} is the father of v_i in L. A vertex v in L is incident to an edge that is not in L only if either v is a big vertex and the root of its connected component in L, or v is a leaf, or v is in a bud. The *pending vertices* of L are the vertices that are not in L but are adjacent to a leaf of L. Note that the pending vertices are small (by construction).

Let B be a bud with father u. Let $S \subseteq V(G) \setminus (B \cup \{u\})$ and let (I, F) be a good d-partition of $S \cup \{u\}$ such that u either is in I or has at most $d-1$ neighbours in F. We show that we can extend the good d-partition to $S \cup \{u\} \cup B$. We proceed as follows: for every vertex $v \in B$, we add v to I if it has no neighbours in I or to F otherwise. The vertices in I clearly form an independent set. Moreover, $G[F]$ has maximum degree at most d and every cycle of $G[F]$ goes through a 2-vertex by construction of a bud. This leads to a good d-partition of $S \cup B \cup \{u\}$. We call that process *colouring the bud* B.

Let v be a 2-vertex of L, u its father and D_v the set of the descendants of v. Let (I, F) be a good d-partition of $S \subseteq V(G) \setminus (D_v \cup \{u, v\})$. We show that we can extend the good d-partition to $S \cup D_v \cup \{v\}$. We proceed as follows:

Step 1. We add every big vertex of D_v to I. Indeed, big vertices form an independent set in L and have no neighbours in S by construction.

Step 2. Every pending vertex $w \in S$ that has no neighbours in I is added to I.

Step 3. We add every 2-vertex of D_v and v to F. Indeed, 2-vertices of D_v form a stable set in L. Moreover, Step 2 ensures that the maximum degree of $G[F]$ is at most d.

Step 4. Finally, we colour every bud. Indeed, the father of every bud of D_v is in I.

This leads to a good d-partition of $S \cup D_v \cup \{v\}$. We call that process *descending* v.

Lemma 8. *For all k, there are no big k-vertices in G that are in L and have k sons in L.*

Proof. Let u be a big k-vertex that has k sons in L. Note that this implies that u is the root of its connected component in L. Let C be the connected component of u in L. Let $H = G - V(C)$. The graph H has fewer vertices than G and thus, by minimality of G, H admits a good d-partition (I, F). Let N be the set of the 2-neighbours of u. We descend every vertex of N. Note that this implies that the son of every vertex of N is put in I,

therefore, up to recolouring the small neighbours of the leaves adjacent to u, we can add every vertex of N to F and u to I. Then we colour every bud of father u. This leads to a good d-partition of G, a contradiction. □

Discharging procedure

Let $\epsilon = 3 - M$. Recall that $d \geq \frac{2}{3-M} - 2 = \frac{2}{\epsilon} - 2$, therefore $\epsilon \geq \frac{2}{d+2} > 0$. We start by assigning to each k-vertex a charge equal to $k - M = k - 3 + \epsilon$. Note that since M is bigger than the average degree of G, the sum of the charges of the vertices is negative. The initial charge of each 3^+-vertex is at least ϵ, and thus is positive.

For every big vertex v, v gives charge $1-\epsilon$ to each of its 2-neighbours that are its sons in L, does not give anything to its father in L (if it has one), and gives $\frac{1-\epsilon}{2}$ to its other 2-neighbours.

Lemma 9. *Every vertex has non-negative charge at the end of the procedure.*

Proof. The small 3^+-vertices start with a non-negative charge, and do not give or receive charge throughout the procedure, thus they have non-negative charge at the end of the procedure.

Every 2-vertex is either in L, in which case it receives $1-\epsilon$ from its father in L, or is not in L and is a non-leaf 2-vertex, in which case it receives $\frac{1-\epsilon}{2}$ from each of its neighbours. As 2-vertices have charge $\epsilon - 1$ in the beginning, and as they receive $1 - \epsilon$, they have charge 0 at the end of the procedure.

Let v be a big k-vertex. By Lemma 8, v has at most $k - 1$ sons in L. Moreover, by construction of L, if v has $k - 1$ sons in L, then either its last neighbour is a 3^+-vertex, or its last neighbour is its father in L (and in both cases v does not give charge to this vertex). Therefore v gives charge amounting to at most $(k - 1)(1 - \epsilon)$. Since its initial charge is $k - 3 + \epsilon$, in the end it has at least $k - 3 + \epsilon - (k - 1)(1 - \epsilon) = k\epsilon - 2$. Since every big vertex has degree at least $d + 2 \geq \frac{2}{\epsilon}$, the final charge of each big vertex is at least $\frac{2}{\epsilon}\epsilon - 2 = 2 - 2 = 0$.

□

By Lemma 9, every vertex has non-negative charge at the end of the procedure, thus the sum of the charges at the end of the procedure is non-negative. Since no charge was created nor removed, this is a contradiction with the fact that the initial sum of the charges is negative. That ends the proof of Lemma 4.

3 Proof of Theorem 2

This proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 1 above. Let $\frac{8}{3} \leq M < 3$, and let d be an integer such that $d \geq \frac{1}{3-M}$. We define good d-partitions as in Section 2. Theorem 2 is implied by the following lemma:

Lemma 10. *Every graph G with $\mathrm{mad}(G) < M$ has a good d-partition.*

For the sake of contradiction, assume that Lemma 10 is false. Let G be a counter example to Lemma 10 with minimum order.

We take the same definitions as before. Lemmas 5–8 are still true in this setting. Frank and Gyárfás [8] prove the following theorem:

Theorem 11 (Frank and Gyárfás [8])**.** *Let $H = (V, E)$ be a graph, and let $\omega : V \to \mathbb{N}$. There exists an orientation such that $\forall v \in V, d^+(v) \geq \omega(v)$ if and only if for all $X \subset V$, $\omega(X) \leq |\{uv \in E, u \in X\}|$.*

Given $H = (V, E)$ and $\omega : V \to \mathbb{N}$, a *good ω-orientation* of H is an orientation of H such that $\forall v \in V, d^+(v) \geq \omega(v)$. We prove some additional lemmas.

Lemma 12. *Let $H = (V, E)$ be a graph on $n \geq 1$ vertices and m edges. Let $\omega : V \to \mathbb{N}$ such that $\omega(V) \leq m$. There exists a subgraph S of H with at least one vertex such that S admits a good ω-orientation.*

Proof. For a graph I and a set $X \subset V(I)$, let $e_I(X) = |\{uv \in E(I), u \in X\}|$. If $\omega(X) \leq e_I(X)$, we say that X is *good* in I.

If every subset of V is good in H, then by Theorem 11, we have a good ω-orientation of H. Therefore we may assume that there is a subset of V that is not good in H. Let X be a maximum subset of V that is not good in H. Let $Y = V - X$, and let $H' = H[Y]$. Note that V is good in H, since $\omega(V) \leq m$, so $Y \neq \emptyset$.

If every subset of Y is good in H', then by Theorem 11, we have a good ω-orientation of H'. Therefore there is a $Z \subset Y$ such that Z is not good in H', i.e. $\omega(Z) > e_{H'}(Z)$. As X is not good in H, we also have $\omega(X) > e_H(X)$. Therefore we have $\omega(X \cup Z) = \omega(X) + \omega(Z) > e_H(X) + e_{H'}(Z) = |\{uv \in E(H), u \in X\}| + |\{uv \in E(H'), u \in Z\}| = |\{uv \in E(H), u \in (X \cup Z)\}| = e_H(X \cup Z)$. Therefore $X \cup Z$ is good in H, which contradicts the maximality of X.

□

We recall that L is the light forest of G.

Lemma 13. *Let U be a non-empty subset of $V(L)$ with no small 3^+-vertices. Let $H = G[U]$ (i.e. the subgraph of G induced by the 2-vertices and the big vertices of $U \subseteq L$). Suppose:*

1. *There is an orientation of the edges of H such that every 2-vertex in H has at least one out-going edge, and for all $i \geq 1$, every big $(d + i + 1)$-vertex in G has at least i out-going edges.*

2. *There are no 1^--vertices in H.*

Then H contains an edge that is not in L and that is incident to a big vertex.

The graph H of Lemma 13 is as follows: it is composed by subtrees of L plus some additional edges (that do not belong to L). Such edges are edges between leaves, and maybe edges between roots of trees of L. The aim of Lemma 13 is to prove the existence of such latter edges.

The orientation in Lemma 13 does not correspond to the orientation defined by the father/son relation. This orientation will allow us to extend a partial partition (I, F): consider a big $(d+i+1)$-vertex v being in F. Vertex v must have at least $i+1$ neighbours in I. The orientation will point towards i sons of v that will be added to I. Moreover we will see that v will have one extra neighbour in I: either its father in L, or a neighbour outside L.

Proof. Assume the lemma is false: every edge of H that is not in L is between two 2-vertices. Let R_0 be the set of the vertices of H that are not the descendants in L of a vertex of H. In particular, R_0 contains the roots of L that are in H, plus big vertices that have no ancestor in U. Note that R_0 contains only big vertices ; otherwise, H would contain 1-vertices. Moreover, $H - R_0$ has at least one vertex, otherwise U would contain only big vertices, there would be an edge between two big vertices, and this edge could not be in L. Let S be the set of the vertices that are not in H, but are descendants of vertices of H.

By minimality of G, the graph $G - (V(H - R_0) \cup S)$ admits a good d-partition (I, F). While there is a vertex $v \in R_0$ that is in F and has no neighbours in I, we put v in I. Now we can assume that every vertex in $R_0 \cap F$ has a neighbour in I. Let $R = R_0$ (in the following we describe a procedure that modifies R but we need to refer to vertices of R_0). While there is a vertex in $R \setminus (F \cup I)$, do the following:

- Suppose u is in I. We descend every 2-vertex with father u (by the procedure every 2-vertex is added to F) and colour every bud with father u. This leads to a good d-partition of u and all its descendants.
- Suppose u is in F. For every 2-vertex v in H with father u such that the edge uv is oriented from u to v, we first add v to I, and then add the son of v to F and R. By hypothesis, if u is a $(d + i + 1)$-vertex, then it has at least i outgoing edges. These edges lead to sons of u:
  - either $u \in R_0$, thus u has no ancestors in H by construction and all its neighbours in H are its sons ; moreover it has a neighbour outside H that is in I (by construction).
  - or, $u \in R \setminus R_0$, this means that u was added to R during the procedure, this implies that his father, say w, is a 2-vertex added to I and the edge wv is oriented from w to v (as every 2-vertex has an out-going edge by hypothesis). It follows that all the out-going neighbours of u are sons of u.

  It follows that u has at least $i + 1$ neighbours in I, and so all other neighbours can be added in F without violating the degree condition on F. Now we descend every 2-vertex $v \notin H$ with father u, and every 2-vertex $v \in H$ with father u such that the edge uv is oriented from v to u, and colour every bud with father u. The only problem that could occur is when two adjacent leaves ℓ and ℓ' are added to I: in that case, since ℓ and ℓ' were added to I, the edge that links ℓ (resp. ℓ') to its father is towards ℓ (resp. ℓ'); it follows that one of ℓ, ℓ' has no out-going edges, contradicting the hypothesis.

In all cases, that leads to a good d-partition of G, a contradiction. □

Lemma 14. *Let U be a non-empty subset of $V(L)$ with no small 3^+-vertices. Let $H = G[U]$ (i.e. the subgraph of G induced by the 2-vertices and the big vertices of $U \subseteq L$). Suppose that H has no edge linking two roots of two connected components of L. Let us denote by $n_2^G(H)$ the number of vertices of H that are 2-vertices in G. Then,*

$$|E(H)| < n_2^G(H) + \sum_{big\ v \in H} (d_G(v) - d - 1)\,.$$

Proof. By contradiction, suppose there exists such a subgraph H with $|E(H)| \geq n_2^G(H) + \sum_{big\ v \in H} (d_G(v) - d - 1)$. Let us define a weight function $\omega : V(H) \to \mathbb{N}$ such that, for every 2-vertex u, $\omega(u) = 1$ and, for every $(d+i+1)$-vertex v, $\omega(v) = i$. By hypothesis, $|E(H)| \geq \sum_{v \in V(H)} \omega(v)$. By Lemma 12, H contains a subgraph S that has a good ω-orientation.

Suppose that S has a vertex of degree 1, say v, and let u be the neighbour of v in S. As $\omega(v) \geq 1$, the only edge incident to v goes from v to u. It follows that, for all $w \neq v$, w has the same number of outgoing edges in S and in $S - \{v\}$. Hence $S - \{v\}$ is a subgraph of H with at least one vertex (it contains u) and has a good ω-orientation. By successively removing vertices of degree 1 from S, we can assume that S is a subgraph of H that has at least one vertex and that admits a good ω-orientation.

By Lemma 13, S has an edge e that is not in L and is incident to a big vertex. As no leaf of L is adjacent to a big vertex except its father, edge e has to link the roots of two connected components of L, contradicting the hypothesis. □

Let $\widehat{L}$ be the graph induced by $V(L)$, where we remove every edge that links the roots of two connected components of L and every bud. An *internal* 2-vertex is a 2-vertex in $\widehat{L}$ that has its two neighbours in $\widehat{L}$. By applying Lemma 14 to $\widehat{L}$, we can bound the number of internal 2-vertices in $\widehat{L}$. We obtain the following lemma:

Lemma 15. *The number of internal 2-vertices is at most* $2\sum_{bigv \in H}(d_G(v) - d - 1)$.

Proof. Let $\widehat{L}'$ be the graph $\widehat{L}$ where every 2-vertex is removed in the following way: if v is an internal 2-vertex with neighbours u and w, then we remove v and add an edge from u to w, and we iterate. Note that $\widehat{L}'$ may have multiple edges and even loops. As for each 2-vertex that was removed, exactly one edge was removed, the number of edges in $\widehat{L}'$ is at most $\sum_{big\ v \in H} (d_G(v) - d - 1)$. By Lemma 6, every edge of $\widehat{L}'$ corresponds to at most two internal 2-vertices. Therefore there are at most $2\sum_{bigv \in H}(d_G(v) - d - 1)$ internal 2-vertices. □

Discharging procedure

Let $\epsilon = 3 - M$ (recall that $\frac{8}{3} \leq M \leq 3$). Recall that $d \geq \frac{1}{3-M} = \frac{1}{\epsilon}$, therefore $\epsilon \geq \frac{1}{d} > 0$.

We assign to each k-vertex a charge equal to $k - M = k - 3 + \epsilon$. Note that since M is bigger than the average degree of G, the sum of the charges of the vertices is negative.

Every 3^+-vertex has a charge of at least $\epsilon > 0$. Therefore every vertex that has a negative charge is a 2-vertex and has charge $\epsilon - 1$. We will redistribute the weight from the 3^+-vertices to the 2-vertices, in order to obtain a non-negative weight on each vertex, by the following three steps:

1. Let S be a maximal set of small 3^+-vertices such that $G[S]$ is connected. Let S_2 be a set of 2-vertices that have exactly one (by Lemma 6) neighbour in S. Note that since $\epsilon \leq 1$, every k-vertex in S has charge at least $(k-2)\epsilon$. The vertices in S give ϵ to each of the vertices in S_2.

   Suppose that the total charge of S becomes negative. This implies that the number of vertices in S_2 is more than $\sum_{v \in S}(d(v) - 2)$. Therefore there are at most $|S| - 1$ edges in $G[S]$, and thus $G[S]$ is a tree. Now by Lemma 7, there is at least one big vertex outside of S that has a neighbour in S. Note that if there are at least two of these vertices, or if one of them has at least two neighbours in S, then one can

observe that $G[S]$ has at most $|S|-2$ edges, contradicting the connectivity of $G[S]$. Therefore S is a bud. In this case, S ends up with a charge of at least $-\epsilon$. We will, in Step 2, make sure that every son of a big vertex in L receives at least $1-2\epsilon \geq \epsilon$ (since $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{3}$) from its father, and this will ensure that every bud ends up with a non-negative charge.

2. For every big vertex v, v gives $1-2\epsilon$ to each of its sons, does not give anything to its father (if it has one), and gives $\frac{1-\epsilon}{2}$ to its other 2-neighbours. Additionally, every big k-vertex gives $2(k-d-1)\epsilon$ to a common pot.

3. The common pot gives ϵ to every internal 2-vertex.

Lemma 16. *Every vertex has non-negative charge at the end of the procedure.*

Proof. Note that by what precedes every small 3^+-vertex v has non-negative charge.

Every 2-vertex that is not in L receives $\frac{1-\epsilon}{2}$ from each of its neighbours. Every leaf that is not adjacent to a 2-vertex (i.e. every 2-vertex of L that is not an internal 2-vertex) receives $1-2\epsilon$ from its father and ϵ from its other neighbour (which is a small 3^+-vertex). Every internal 2-vertex receives $1-2\epsilon$ from its father and ϵ from the common pot. Therefore every 2-vertex has charge 0 at the end of the procedure.

Let us prove that every big vertex has non-negative charge at the end of the procedure. Let v be a big k-vertex. Let $c(v)$ be the initial charge of v, and $c'(v)$ be the final charge of v. Suppose by contradiction that $c'(v) < 0$. By Lemma 8, vertex v has at most $k-1$ sons. Moreover, if v has $k-1$ sons, then its last neighbour is either the father of v, or a 3^+-vertex (by construction of L). Recall that $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{3}$, therefore $1-2\epsilon \geq \frac{1-2\epsilon}{2}$. If v has $k-1$ sons, then v gives $1-2\epsilon$ to each of its $k-1$ sons, and $2(k-d-1)\epsilon$ to the common pot, therefore $c'(v) = c(v) - (1-2\epsilon)(k-1) + 2(k-d-1)\epsilon$, and thus as $c'(v) < 0$, we have $c(v) < (1-2\epsilon)(k-2)+1-\epsilon+2(k-d-1)\epsilon$. If v has $k-2$ sons, then it gives $1-2\epsilon$ to each of its $k-2$ sons, and may give at most $\frac{1-\epsilon}{2}$ to its two other neighbours and $2(k-d-1)\epsilon$ to the common pot, therefore $c(v) < (1-2\epsilon)(k-2)+1-\epsilon+2(k-d-1)\epsilon$. If we decrease the number of sons of v further than $k-2$, we will still have $c(v) < (1-2\epsilon)(k-2)+1-\epsilon+2(k-d-1)\epsilon$.

Thus if $c(v) \geq (1-2\epsilon)(k-2)+1-\epsilon+2(k-d-1)\epsilon$, we get a contradiction. Recall that $c(v)$ is equal to $k-3+\epsilon$. Therefore we only need to prove that $k-3+\epsilon \geq (1-2\epsilon)(k-2)+1-\epsilon+2(k-d-1)\epsilon$, which is equivalent to $d \geq \frac{1}{\epsilon}$. □

Let us prove that the common pot also has non-negative charge at the end of the procedure. It receives charge $\sum_{v \text{ big}} 2(d(v)-d-1)\epsilon$. By Lemma 15, this charge is at least ϵ times the number of internal 2-vertices. The common pot gives ϵ to each internal 2-vertex, therefore it has non-negative charge at the end of the procedure.

By Lemma 16, every vertex has non-negative charge at the end of the procedure, thus the sum of the charges at the end of the procedure is non-negative. Since no charge was created nor removed, and since the common pot also has non-negative charge, this is a contradiction with the fact that the initial sum of the charges is negative. That ends the proof of Theorem 2.

References

[1] K. Appel and W. Haken. Every planar map is four colorable. Part 1: Discharging. *Illinois Journal of Mathematics*, 21:429–490, 1977.

[2] K. Appel, W. Haken, and J. Koch. Every planar map is four colorable. Part 2: Reducibility. *Illinois Journal of Mathematics*, 21:491–567, 1977.

[3] O.V. Borodin. A proof of Grünbaum's conjecture on the acyclic 5-colorability of planar graphs (Russian). *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 231(1):18–20, 1976.

[4] O.V. Borodin and A.N. Glebov. On the partition of a planar graph of girth 5 into an empty and an acyclic subgraph (Russian). *Diskretnyi Analiz i Issledovanie Operatsii*, 8(4):34–53, 2001.

[5] O.V. Borodin, A.O. Ivanova, M. Montassier, P. Ochem, and A. Raspaud. Vertex decompositions of sparse graphs into an edgeless subgraph and a subgraph of maximum degree at most k. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 65(2):83–93, 2010.

[6] O.V. Borodin and A.V. Kostochka. Vertex partitions of sparse graphs into an independent vertex set and subgraph of maximum degree at most one (Russian). *Sibirsk. Mat. Zh.*, 52:1004–1010, 2011,
Translation in: *Siberian Mathematical Journal*, 52:796–801, 2011.

[7] O.V. Borodin and A.V. Kostochka. Defective 2-colorings of sparse graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 104:72–80, 2014.

[8] A. Frank and A. Gyárfás. How to orient the edges of a graph. In *Combinatorics, I, Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai*, volume 18, pages 353–364, 1978.

[9] J. Kim, A. Kostochka, and X. Zhu. Improper coloring of sparse graphs with a given girth, I:(0, 1)-colorings of triangle-free graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 42:26–48, 2014.

[10] K.S. Poh. On the linear vertex-arboricity of a plane graph. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 14(1):73–75, 1990.